

REMARKS

This paper is a Submission Required under 37 CFR 1.114 accompanying a Request for Continued Examination and is responsive to the final rejection of the claims dated July 11, 2008. Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested. Claim 1 is amended; Applicants have not added new matter. Support in the originally filed specification for the amendment to claim 1 is given on page 13, lines 9-10 which states that the "print head moves in contact with the photosensitive film" and as shown in Figures 4A, 5A and 5B. Claims 1-10 are pending.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5 and 9 as being obvious over Aosaki '359 in view of Imai '941; of claim 3 as being obvious over Aosaki '359, Imai '941 and further in view of Anderson '501; and of claims 6-8 and 10 as being obvious over Aosaki '359, Imai '941 and further in view of Ohba '312. None of the cited references teach or suggest that the projection protruding beyond the lens toward the photosensitive recording medium is held in direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium, as required by claim 1.

The rejection of independent claim 1, upon which all other claims are dependent, admits that Aosaki '359 does not teach that the projection protruding beyond the lens toward the photosensitive recording medium comes into direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium. The rejection states that Imai '941 teaches this claim limitation. Imai '941 states at column 5, lines 57-60 that "the print head 2 faces the top of the print object 10 with a small gap (see FIG. 2)." (emphasis added). The small gap is required, moreover, so that bubbles of ink are projected from the ink projection face 2b to the paper, *see* column 5, lines 6-7. The gap between the ink projection face and the print object is inherent in an ink jet print head, otherwise the ink could not be properly projected onto the paper. The fact that Imai '941 has a small gap, which is also acknowledged by the rejection on page 5, end of the first paragraph, teaches against the element of claim 1 that the protruding projection is held in direct contact with the photosensitive medium. Thus, because neither Imai '941 nor Aosaki '359 teach or suggest that protruding projection is held in direct contact with the photosensitive

JAN 08 2009

recording medium, their combination cannot render claim 1 as being obvious. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Applicants also contend that claims 2-10 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence upon independent claim 1. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection of these claims.

Applicants request that the claims be allowed and that the case be passed to issuance. If, however, any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300) at 612.455.3804 to resolve these issues.



Dated: January 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/KO/ad